

enemy and a higher cost in Indian casualties due to frontal assaults on towering peaks.

Presently, with the fighting in the Kargil area stabilizing in India's favor, Pakistan is in dire need for a dramatic breakout to salvage some achievements from an otherwise doomed strategic gambit. Moreover, Beijing—Pakistan's closest ally and strategic patron that has its own territorial claims for parts of Indian Kashmir—is expressing growing interest in the outcome of the crisis. The People's Republic of China (PRC) is ready to intervene in the crisis in order to safeguard its own strategic interests.

In order to meet the prerequisites of such a breakout Pakistan has been pursuing a twin track policy:

On the one hand, Islamabad has been threatening the escalation of the crisis into a major war that, given the declared nuclear status of both protagonists, might escalate into a nuclear war. In order to ensure that Islamabad's threat of war is considered credible, the Pakistani Armed Forces have undertaken several steps since mid June. Pakistan put the Armed Forces on "red alert", sent the Navy out to sea, is moving military reinforcements to the border with India, parading units through the streets of cities and towns, is conducting civil and home defense exercises for the population, as well as deploying air defense forces to all airports and key civilian sites.

On the other hand, Pakistan, with Beijing's active support, has been raising the possibility of a "negotiated settlement" to the Kargil crisis. In these political initiatives, the Pakistanis stress the need to resolve the crisis before it escalates out of control and a major, and potentially nuclear, war erupts. In reality, Islamabad is desperate to extract tangible gains from the cross-border intrusion of its forces before they are defeated and evicted by the Indian Army. And it is in these circumstances that the proposed negotiated solutions for the Kargil crisis are being offered.

The most popular "package deal" which the Clinton administration seems to favor at this juncture calls for Islamabad's quiet and unacknowledged withdrawing of the Pakistani troops in return for the opening of an international negotiations process over the entire Kashmir problem. Such dynamics, the deal's proponents tell us, will provide Pakistan with a "face-saving" outlet out of the armed conflict before it escalates into a wider war.

However, there are many pitfalls in this approach. In all political discussions to-date, the Pakistani forces involved are still formally defined as "militants"—thus absolving Pakistan of the formal responsibility for what can otherwise be termed an act of war. Further more, the mere international acceptance without challenge of the Pakistani excuse that these "militants" are operating in an area where the Line of Control (the Indo-Pakistani cease-fire line in Kashmir) is not properly delineated and that therefore these "militants" are actually on Pakistani soil, contradicts the 1972 Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan. This argument is therefore making a mockery of any such bilateral agreements at the very moment both New Delhi and Islamabad are being urged by the international community to negotiate and ultimately sign yet another agree-

ment on the 'Kashmir problem.' Then, the commonly discussed percept of the "Kashmir problem" refers to the conditions of the Muslim population living in the Kashmir valley. Thus, the negotiations will delve on the fate of the Indian held part of Kashmir even though India, Pakistan and even the PRC each controls wide segments of the British-era Kashmir.

Ultimately, international acceptance of these principles will reward Pakistan for its armed aggression and punish India for its self-restraint in evicting the intruders. Moreover, any political outcome in which Pakistan's interests are met will also reward Beijing. The PRC, one should note, has just tested in a major military exercise in nearby Tibet, a quick reaction intervention force optimized for the region's rugged terrain. Moreover, the new strategic posture at the heart of Asia that will emerge from these negotiations will serve as a precedent for similar aggressive wars-by-proxy that could then be repeated and adopted throughout the developing world to the detriment of the interests of the United States and its Western allies.

Mr. Speaker, in our pursuit to defuse a brewing crisis before it escalates into a war we should not ignore the overall enduring strategic interests of the United States. The United States does have long-term vital interests in Asia. Democratic and pro-Western India is a bulwark of stability in a region rife with such anti-U.S. forces and mega-trends as the hegemonic ascent of a PRC determined to become the regional supreme power at the expense of the United States, the spread of radical militant Islam and Islamist terrorism, as well as the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and long-range delivery systems by rogue states. At the same time, free access to the energy resources of Central Asia is crucial for the long-term economic development of the United States, while the sea lanes of communications in the Indian Ocean sustain the West's commercial relations with East Asia.

Thus, any 'Kashmir' agreement based on the principles mentioned above will weaken India, reward and encourage the anti-U.S. forces, and will thus adversely affect the long-term national interests of the United States.

It is, therefore, in the self-interest of the United States to pursue a negotiated process that will take into consideration the U.S. quintessential dynamics and interests in the region and will thus secure the American national interest. Such a process might take longer to define and be more intricate to attain. However, a genuine solution to such a complex problem as the Kashmir dispute will most likely endure future trials and tribulation. Thus, a genuine solution will ensure at the least a semblance of stability in a turbulent region that is of great importance to the United States. Congress should therefore encourage the Clinton administration to adopt such a principled approach to formulating the U.S. position toward the Kargil crisis. Congress should make sure the U.S. position does not reward aggression, challenge the viability of the principle that legitimate international agreements remain valid and not vulnerable to the sudden expediency of one signatory or another, and support the creation of a conducive environment for the genuine solution of the entire

Kashmir problem—that of the areas held by India, Pakistan, and the PRC. Further more, we should congratulate the Indian government for the responsibility, maturity and self-restraint demonstrated in this crisis and encourage it to stay the course despite the mounting pressures.

---

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE W. "WILL" GAHAGAN

#### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 1, 1999*

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to note the passing of a prominent American citizen, George W. "Will" Gahagan, who died in Carmel, California on December 8, 1998 at the age of 86.

Will was a man of broad interests, and notable achievements. He was well-educated, graduating in 1949 from Dartmouth, and worked as a newspaper reporter, federal public relations officer and foreign press liaison officer at the 1945 inaugural United Nations conference in San Francisco. Will attended Harvard during his graduate years, and in 1957 received his master's degree from Stanford University. During his Dartmouth years he met the poet Robert Frost, who was on the faculty, and later founded the California Friends of Robert Frost, non-profit organization that helped establish Frost Plaza in San Francisco, Mr. Frost's birthplace.

Will was an educator as much as he was a student. He taught English for 15 years at high schools, including Tulare City, Junipero Serra High School and Santa Catalina School in Monterey. He also taught at an international school in Rome. His students benefited greatly from his tuteledge and enthusiasm for learning.

Will's contributions to Monterey County were as far-reaching as his range of interests. He wrote a column "Word Wise" for the Monterey Herald, produced and hosted a foreign affairs television program in Salinas, and wrote a guidebook about the Monterey Peninsula. He worked with many local organizations including the Carmel Foundation, the World Affairs Council, the Carmel City Planning Commission and the Carmel Library. Will helped create the Dennis the Menace Playground in Monterey, and helped raise \$250,000 for the Robinson Jeffers Tor House in Carmel. He was a member of the senior and super-senior national tennis teams, successfully competing in tournaments in Canada and Europe. Will has been inducted into the Dartmouth College Athletic Hall of Fame.

No list of accomplishment can represent the generosity of spirit, the vitality, and the intelligence that Will demonstrated every day. Will is to be remembered as an exemplary human being. He is survived by his wife Lorna; his sons Michael and Mark; his daughters Tappy and Lissa; his brother John; and, seven grandchildren. He will be sorely missed by all who had the privilege of knowing him.

July 1, 1999

MR. JOHN TOPOLEWSKI AWARDED  
FRANCE'S KNIGHT'S CROSS OF  
THE FRENCH LEGION OF HONOR

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride to honor a 104 year old veteran in my district. John Topolewski was awarded France's Knight Cross of the French Legion of Honor on Wednesday, June 16, 1999 in Toledo, Ohio. The Knight's Cross is the highest award given by France to citizens of other countries. The award was presented to Mr. Topolewski by France's Consul General Alain de Keghel, the second ranking French official in the U.S., in front of a replica of the troop train which transported U.S. troops to France in World War I. Mr. Topolewski was one of those "Doughboys" and a member of the 82nd Infantry Division. The nation of France has bestowed the Knight's Cross upon John Topolewski for uncommon valor in the trenches as he fought in the United States Army during World War I.

The Greek historian Thucydides wrote "remember that this greatness was won by men with courage, with knowledge of their duty, and with a sense of honor in action . . . but the bravest are surely those who have the clearest vision of what is before them, glory and danger alike, and yet notwithstanding go out to meet it." As a young man at the dawn of his adulthood, John Topolewski embodied these words. He acted because he thought it his duty to his comrades, his country, and the world, not out of a desire for recognition, glory or awards. Consul General Keghel told him as he gave him the medal "More than two million American soldiers were sent across the Atlantic Ocean. The French have not forgot their bravery more than eighty years later. Today it is your turn, Mr. John Topolewski, to be honored. You served in dangerous conditions. You belong for sure among the veterans here."

John Topolewski stands today as a symbol of thousands of nameless heroes of that first great world wide conflict, and the ones which followed. He is a reminder of the humanness in war, of sacrifices made to preserve liberty and regain freedoms withheld. Although I was unable to personally be with him as he received this belated honor, I salute John Topolewski, and thank him on behalf of the people of our nation and freedom lovers world-wide.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL NEED  
FOR RECONCILIATION AND  
HEALING AND RECOMMENDING A  
CALL FOR DAYS OF PRAYER

SPEECH OF

### HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House failed to suspend the rules and agree

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to a resolution that would have recommended that our nation's leaders call for a day of prayer, fasting, and humiliation before God. The Wichita Eagle, a leading Kansas newspaper, asked the Kansas U.S. Representatives to provide a statement explaining their votes on this proposal. I want to take this opportunity to include my response letter in the RECORD.

CATHY WILFONG,  
Wichita Eagle.

DEAR MS. WILFONG: On June 29, 1999, I was asked to vote on House Concurrent Resolution 94, a resolution asking that Congress "... call the people they serve to observe, a day of solemn prayer, fasting, and humiliation before God." I voted against the resolution. Here's why:

As a citizen, I value my own religious freedom so very much that I would be insulted if Congress told me how to pray, or how to honor and how to reconcile my relationship with God. In fact, our country was formed by people who came here seeking religious freedom and seeking to escape the tyranny of a king in England who told them how to pray and what kind of religion they would practice. One of the wonderful things about our country is that every person has an opportunity to practice (or not practice) religion exactly as he/she wishes.

For me, religion is an intensely personal thing. I would never presume to tell somebody else how to pray or practice religion. And I would not appreciate anybody doing that to me.

I was struck by the language in the House Resolution which stated that "... it is the necessary duty of the people of this Nation not to only to humbly offer up our prayers and needs to Almighty God, but also in a solemn and public manner to confess our shortcomings ..."

I invite the authors of this resolution to read Matthew 6:5-6. According to my Bible, Jesus said: "And when you pray, you must not be like the hypocrites, for they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and at the street corners, that they may be seen by men. Truly, I say to you, they have received their reward. But when you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father who is in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you."

Just maybe our founding fathers had it right. In matters of faith, perhaps it is best that people have the freedom to practice religion as they wish without instruction from their government or from Congress.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS MOORE,  
Member of Congress.

RECOGNIZING MR. EDWARD "ED"  
RENFROW, STATE CONTROLLER  
OF NORTH CAROLINA

### HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the Congress to State Controller of North Carolina Edward "Ed" Renfrow of Smithfield, NC.

On March 19, 1999, the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) presented Mr. Renfrow with the distinguished 1998 Donald L. Scantlebury Memorial Award for Distinguished Leadership in Financial Man-

agement Improvement at their 28th Annual Financial Management Conference in Washington, DC. The JFMIP is a cooperative initiative of the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management to improve financial management practices and policies in the public sector.

The Scantlebury awards were named for the former Chief Accountant of the GAO, and were established to give the highest recognition to government executives who have demonstrated outstanding leadership and improvement in financial management in the public sector. The award was presented to Mr. Renfrow by David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States.

Governor James B. Hunt of North Carolina nominated Mr. Renfrow for the award stating, "Throughout his distinguished career, Ed Renfrow has served the citizens of North Carolina by providing sustained, high quality leadership in financial management at both the state and national levels. Ed has been a strong voice for fiscal accountability and responsibility within government and has been instrumental in reducing costs and promoting the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of government operations. The awards committee could not have recognized a more accomplished leader in the area of financial management and I congratulate him on this prestigious award."

Mr. Renfrow has distinguished himself through a lengthy career of public service to the people of North Carolina. I am proud to say that I share personal and professional paths with Mr. Renfrow, both of us having grown up in Johnston County and serving together on the North Carolina Council of State from 1989 to 1993. Mr. Renfrow began his career of elective public service in 1974 when he was elected to the North Carolina General Assembly, serving three 2-year Senate terms. In 1980, Mr. Renfrow began his first of three 4-year terms as North Carolina's State Auditor. Mr. Renfrow's current position as North Carolina's State Controller began in 1993 with his appointment by Governor Hunt and subsequent confirmation by the General Assembly. His current term as State Controller ends on June 30, 2001.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating Edward "Ed" Renfrow on this most recent award, continuing recognition of his long career of public service.

"THAT'S WHAT AMERICA MEANS  
TO ME"

### HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate enough to hear from American citizens from all walks of life. I have heard the many voices throughout this nation about what this country means to them. They have expressed their appreciation, love, gratitude and pride for America. I have heard from the veteran who has voiced strong convictions about the value